

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 6 have been amended. Claims 13 - 26 have been added. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claims, all of which are supported in the application as originally filed. Claim 12 has been cancelled from the application without prejudice (and Claims 7 - 11 were previously cancelled without prejudice). Claims 1 - 6 and 13 - 26 are now in the application.

Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as claim amendments and cancellations in the present application are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of the currently-presented claims at an early date. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

I. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §102(b)

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated June 23, 2008 (hereinafter, “the Office Action”) states that Claims 1 - 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 6,731,393 to Currans et al. (hereinafter, “Currans”). Claims 1 - 6 have been amended, and Claim 12 has been cancelled from the application without prejudice, rendering the rejection moot as to Claim 12. Applicants will demonstrate herein that Claims 1 - 6, as currently presented, are not anticipated by Currans.

As currently presented, the first element of independent Claim 1 recites:

responsive to selection, by a user from a view of content displayed on a graphical user interface from a source address, of a portion of the displayed content, parsing a markup language document from which the view was created and generating a content selection document that specifies how to create the selected portion from the parsed markup language document; (emphasis added)

This “parsing ... and generating ...” is discussed at least on pages 11 - 12 of the Specification as originally filed. For example, see the description of parsing on page 11, lines 5 - 8, “Preferred embodiments parse the underlying content of the Web page (which is typically specified in HTML syntax) ...”, and the discussion of generating a document reflecting the user’s content selection on page 11, line 12 - page 12, line 2. An example of this document (shown as a markup language document) reflecting the user’s selection is illustrated at 300 in Fig. 3.

Applicants find no disclosure in Currans of “... parsing ... and generating ...” that occurs “responsive to selection, by a user ... of a portion of the displayed content”, as currently recited in this first element of Claim 1.

As currently presented, the third element of independent Claim 1 recites:

subsequently evaluating an updated version of the content from the source address, using the content selection document, to create an updated version of the selected portion (emphasis added)

This “subsequently evaluating ...” is discussed at least on pages 22 - 23 of the Specification as originally filed. For example, see the discussion of the updated version of the content on page 22, lines 6 - 9, “... initiates a content evaluation by querying ... which in turn

causes ... retriev[al of] data from the [same] source Web page ...” and on page 23, lines 1 - 2. “... clip content from a current version of the Web page ...”. Evaluating the updated version using the content selection document is discussed on page 23, lines 3 - 5, “Preferably, the same XPath code [shown by way of example at 300 in Fig. 3] ... is used for creating this [updated version] ...”.

Applicants find no disclosure in Currans of “subsequently evaluating ... content ... using the content selection document ...” as currently recited in this third element of Claim 1.

In view of the above, Claim 1 is deemed patentable over Currans. Dependent Claims 2 - 6 are therefore deemed patentable by virtue of at least the patentability of Claim 1 from which they depend.

The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection of all remaining claims as currently presented.

II. Added Claims 13 - 26

Added independent Claims 13 and 21 recite claim language analogous to independent Claim 1, and are therefore deemed patentable over Currans by virtue of the same arguments presented above with regard to Claim 1. Added dependent Claims 14 - 20 and 22 - 26 are deemed patentable at least by virtue of the patentability of Claims 13 and 21 from which they depend.

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims and allowance of all currently-presented claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/

Marcia L. Doubet
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-343-7587